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#### Abstract

The work continues some earlier investigations into dynamic properties of prestressed incompressible elastic materials. Whereas the material was previously assumed to be a Mooney material, it is here allowed to have any strain energy function. Plane wave propagation and the motions caused by an impulsive line of traction are examined. The results obtained are compared with the earlier work.


## 1. Introduction

This work is an extension of some earlier work by Belward [1] concerning the small motions of an elastic solid about a state of finite pure homogeneous biaxial deformation. In the previous work the material was assumed to be a Mooney material; here it is only assumed to be isotropic, incompressible and hyperelastic. The results of the analysis concern plane wave propagation and the response of the material to line impulses of traction. The generalisation to any strain energy function makes the analysis more detailed but not intractable. Many of the results obtained in [1] are preserved and the results for the two problems can easily be compared.

The secular equation for the speeds of propagation of plane waves is derived. It is factored into two simple terms from which the two permissible wave speeds are deduced and the corresponding amplitudes
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calculated. The two waves can be characterised by their dependence on the strain energy function. One of these involves the first order derivatives of the strain energy function only, while the other depends on both first and second order derivatives. Thus only one wave distinguishes between a Mooney material and one with a more general strain energy function. By requiring that there exist two real wave speeds in every direction in the material, the well known Baker-Ericksen conditions on the strain energy function are reproduced. The same type of argument is also used to determine restrictions on the constants which appear in a strain energy function proposed by Signorini [3].

The response of the material to impulsive lines of traction applied along the principal directions of the underlying strain is also examined. Some favourable uncoupling of the equations of motion occurs (this can be anticipated from the secular equation) and this enables the displacement and pressure fields at small and large times to be investigated in some detail.

## 2. Basic equations

Frequent reference will be made to the earlier paper by Belward [1] and the analysis, wherever it follows that in [1], will be given in outline only.

Consider a body of homogeneous, isotropic, incompressible, hyperelastic material with strain energy function $W$. Let the body be given an initial finite static pure homogeneous deformation in which a particle at $X_{i}$ (in a rectangular cartesian coordinate system) moves to $y_{i}$. The Cauchy stress is $t_{i j}$ where

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{i, j}=-p \delta_{i j}+\left(2 W_{1}+2 I_{1} W_{2}\right) B_{i j}-2 W_{2} B_{i s} B_{s j}, \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

(repeated suffixes imply sumation over $s=1,2,3$ ), $B_{i j}$ is the left Cauchy-Green strain tensor,

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{i j}=\frac{\partial y_{i}}{\partial X_{s}} \frac{\partial y_{i}}{\partial X_{s}}, \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$W_{1}$ and $W_{2}$ are derivatives of the strain energy function with respect to
two invariants of the strain,
(2.3) $W_{1}=\frac{\partial \dot{W}}{\partial I_{1}}, \quad I_{1}=B_{s s} ; \quad W_{2}=\frac{\partial W}{\partial I_{2}}, \quad I_{2}=\frac{1}{2}\left(B_{s s}{ }_{q}{ }_{q q}-B_{s q}{ }^{B}{ }_{s q}\right)$,
and $p$ is a hydrostatic pressure.
Suppose that a particle at $y_{i}$ now moves to $x_{i}$, and that this displacement is small in the sense that

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{i}-y_{i}=\varepsilon u_{i} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and all terms involving powers of $\varepsilon$ greater than unity can be ignored. Now if the stress, strain energy, pressure, etc are all expanded in powers of $\varepsilon$ thus:

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{i j}(\varepsilon)=t_{i j}+\varepsilon t_{i j}^{(1)}+\ldots, \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

the perturbed stress can be shown to be given by

$$
\text { (2.6) } \begin{aligned}
t_{i j}^{(1)}=-p^{(1)} & \delta_{i j}+J_{1} W_{2} B_{i j}+2\left(H_{1}+I_{1} W_{2}\right)\left(u_{i, s} B_{s j}+u_{j, s} B_{s i}\right) \\
& -2 W_{2}\left(u_{\left.i, q^{B_{s}} B_{8} B_{j}+u_{j, q} B_{i s} B_{s q}+u_{s, q}\left(B_{i q} B_{s j}+B_{i s} B_{j q}\right)\right)}\right. \\
& +\left(J_{1} W_{11}+\left(J_{1} I_{1}+J_{2}\right) W_{12}+I_{1} J_{2} W_{22}\right) B_{i j}-\left(J_{1} W_{12}+J_{2} W_{22}\right) B_{i s} B_{s j},
\end{aligned}
$$

where
(2.7) $u_{i, j}=\frac{\partial u_{i}}{\partial y_{j}}, J_{1}=4 u_{8}, q^{B_{B}}, J_{2}=4 u_{B, q}\left(B_{8 q} B_{r r}-B_{B r} B_{q r}\right)$,
and the quantities $I, J, W$ and $B$ are evaluated in the state of homogeneous deformation. (Some small changes have been made to the notation used in [1] and some minor misprints corrected.) For a pure homogeneous biaxial deformation with principal axes parallel to the coordinate axes we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{1}=\mu x_{1}, y_{2}=\mu x_{2}, y_{3}=\lambda x_{3}, \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\mu^{2} \lambda=1$, the incompressibility condition.
When (2.8) is introduced into equations (2.6) and (2.7) and the latter equation entered into the equations of motion the following form for the equations of motion for the perturbed displacements $u_{i}$ is obtained:
(2.9) $-p_{, 1}+2 a u_{1,11}+(a-b) u_{1,22}+c u_{1,33}+(a+b) u_{2,21}+(a+h) u_{3,31}=$ $=\rho u_{1, t}-\rho f_{1}$,
(2.10) $-p_{, 2}+(a+b) u_{1,12}+(a-b) u_{2,11}+2 a u_{2,22}+c u_{2,33}+(a+h) u_{3,22}=$ $=\rho u_{2, t t}-\rho f_{2}$,
(2.11) $-p_{, 3}+c u_{1,31}+c u_{2,32}+a u_{3,11}+a u_{3,22}+(2 c+k) u_{3,33}=$ $=\rho u_{3, t t}-\rho f_{3}$.

The displacements must also satisfy the incompressibility condition,

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{1,1}+u_{2,2}+u_{3,3}=0 \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The constants appearing in equations (2.9, 2.10 and 2.11) are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { (2.13) } a=2 \mu^{2}\left(W_{1}+\mu^{2} W_{2}\right), \quad b=2 W_{2} \mu^{2}\left(\mu^{2}-\lambda^{2}\right), \quad c=2 \lambda^{2}\left(W_{1}+\mu^{2} W_{2}\right),  \tag{2.13}\\
& \text { (2.14) } 4\left(\lambda^{2}-\mu^{2}\right)=h \mu^{-2}\left(W_{11}+\left(2 \mu^{2}+\lambda^{2}\right) W_{12}+\mu^{2}\left(\mu^{2}+\lambda^{2}\right) W_{22}\right)^{-1} \\
& =k \lambda^{-2}\left(W_{11}+3 \mu^{2} W_{12}+2 \mu^{4} W_{22}\right)^{-1} .
\end{align*}
$$

(The superscript (1) has been suppressed in the perturbed pressure, and the body force $f_{k}$.)

The equations of motion used in [1] correspond to the above equations with $k=h=0$. Because $h$ and $k$ only appear associated with $u_{3,33}$ the more general case does not increase the complexity of the problem as greatly as might be anticipated. In particular in any motions independent of $y_{3}$ the results of [1] apply directly.

## 3. Propagation of plane waves

Plane wave solutions of equations (2.9)-(2.12) are sought by introducing the functions

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{k}=A_{k}\left(y_{j}\right) \exp \left(i \omega\left(y_{s} z_{s}-v t\right)\right), \quad p=P \exp \left(i \omega\left(y_{s} z_{s}+v t\right)\right) \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

into the equations and setting $f_{k}=0$. If $l_{s} l_{s}=1$ then $v$ is the speed of propagation of the wave. Four linear equations in $A_{k}$ and $P$ result and the determinantal condition that these have non-trivial
solutions reduces to

$$
\text { (3.2) }\left[(a-b)\left(i_{1}^{2}+l_{2}^{2}\right)+c z_{3}^{2}-\rho v^{2}\right]\left[a\left(i_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}\right)+c z_{3}^{2}+(k-h)\left(z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}\right) z_{3}^{2}-\rho v^{2}\right]=0
$$

This is the secular equation for the squared speeds of propagation of the wave forms (3.1) in the direction $Z_{k}$. We note that only one of the two wave speeds exhibits a dependence on the second order derivatives of $W$. This is also true of the pressure and amplitude. When $\rho v^{2}=(a-b)\left(z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}\right)+c l_{3}^{2}$, the pressure and amplitudes are given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
P: \tau_{1} A_{1}+\tau_{2} A_{2}: A_{3}=0: 1: 0 ; \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

the wave is a constant pressure wave polarised in the planes parallel to the $y_{1} y_{2}$ plane. For $\rho v^{2}=a\left(z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}\right)+c z_{3}^{2}+(k-h) z_{3}^{2}\left(z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}\right)$, (3.4) $P: A_{1}: A_{2}: A_{3}=-i\left(h\left(z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}\right)+(k-h)\left(z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}\right) z_{3}^{2}\right): z_{1}: z_{2}: z_{3}^{-z_{3}^{-1} .}$
(In [1] the counterpart of (3.4) is in error; it should be replaced by (3.4) with $h=k=0$.)

In order that there exist two real wave speeds in each direction we require
(3.5) $(a-b)\left(z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}\right)+c l_{3}^{2}>0$ and $a\left(z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}\right)+c z_{3}^{2}+(k-h) z_{3}^{2}\left(z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}\right)>0$. From (3.5) 1 , in view of (2.13), we deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
W_{1}+\lambda^{2} W_{2} \geq 0 \text { and } W_{1}+\mu^{2} W_{2} \geq 0 \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

with equality permitted in only one of (3.6). These are the BakerFricksen conditions on the strain energy function obtained by many previous writers and first for incompressible materials by Truesdel| [4]. The inequality ( 3.5$)_{2}$ does not give information of any value for a general strain energy function, however it can be applied to the strain energy function

$$
\begin{equation*}
W=\alpha\left(I_{1}-3\right)+\beta\left(I_{2}-3\right)+\gamma\left(I_{2}-3\right)^{2} \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

proposed by Signorini [3] and studied lately by Manacorda [2]. It is easy to show that the condition ( 3.5$)_{2}$ implies that the inequalities

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha+4 \gamma>0, \gamma>0, \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

are necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of two real wave speeds in any direction.
4. The response to impulsive line tractions: (i) General remarks

The remainder of the paper is concerned with various aspects of the solution of equations (2.9)-(2.12) when $\rho f_{k}=w_{k} \delta\left(y_{2}\right) \delta\left(y_{3}\right) \delta(t)$, $\left(w_{k}\right.$ is a constant vector). This amounts to finding the response of the material to a line impulse of traction acting along the $y_{l}$ axis. Because the initial homogeneous deformation has equal extensions in the $y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$ directions, and because the equations of motion are autonomous in $y_{k}$ and $t$, this is equivalent to finding the response of the material to any line of traction in the $y_{1} y_{2}$ plane. (As mentioned previously, if the force acts along the $y_{3}$ axis the results are the same as for the corresponding problem in [1].)

Derivatives with respect to $y_{1}$ disappear from the equations of motion and Fourier transforms are taken in $y_{2}, y_{3}$ and $t$ thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\bar{u}_{k}, \bar{p}\right)=\int_{\Omega} \exp \left(i\left(\xi_{B} y_{s}+\omega t\right)\right)\left(u_{k}, p\right) d \xi_{k} d t . \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The resulting equations are linear in $\bar{u}_{k}$ and $\bar{p}$ and their solutions are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{u}_{1}=\frac{w_{1}}{(a-b) \xi_{2}^{2}+c \xi_{3}^{2}-\rho \omega^{2}} \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

(4.3) $\frac{\bar{u}_{2}}{w_{2} \xi_{3}^{2}+w_{3} \xi_{2} \xi_{3}}=\frac{\bar{u}_{3}}{w_{2} \xi_{2} \xi_{3}-w_{3} \xi_{2}^{2}}=\left[\left(\xi_{2}^{2}+\xi_{3}^{2}\right)\left(\rho \omega^{2}-a \xi_{2}^{2}-c \xi_{3}^{2}\right)-(k-h) \xi_{2}^{2} \xi_{3}^{2}\right]^{-1}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{p}=-\frac{i \xi_{2}\left[a \xi_{2}^{2}+(c+k) \xi_{3}^{2}-\rho \omega^{2}\right) \omega_{2}+i \xi_{3}\left((a-h) \xi_{2}^{2}+c \xi_{3}^{2}-\rho \omega^{2}\right) \omega_{3}}{\left(\xi_{2}^{2}+\xi_{3}^{2}\right)\left[a \xi_{2}^{2}+c \xi_{3}^{2}-\rho \omega^{2}\right]+(k-h) \xi_{2}^{2} \xi_{3}^{2}} \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows that the response of the material consists of two travelling waves, one carried by $u_{1}$ and the other carried by $u_{2}, u_{3}$ and $p$. The
inverse of $\bar{u}_{1}$ is simply a fundamental solution of the wave equation in two dimensions (cf. equation (5.7) in [1])
(4.5) $u_{1}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}\frac{w_{1}}{2 \pi(a-b)^{\frac{2}{2}} c^{\frac{1}{2}}}\left(t^{2}-\frac{\rho y_{2}^{2}}{a-b}-\frac{\rho y_{3}^{2}}{a}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & t>\left(\frac{\rho y_{2}^{2}}{a-b}+\frac{\rho y_{3}^{2}}{c}\right)^{\frac{2}{2}}, \\ 0 & , t<\left(\frac{\rho y_{2}^{2}}{a-b}+\frac{\rho y_{3}^{2}}{c}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},\end{array}\right.$,

At this stage the complexity involved in dealing with any strain energy function begins to obstruct the analysis. In order to determine $u_{2}$ and $u_{3}$ it is necessary to invert

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{\Psi}=\left[\left(\xi_{2}^{2}+\xi_{3}^{2}\right)\left(a \xi_{2}^{2}+c \xi_{3}^{2}-\rho \omega^{2}\right)+(k-h) \xi_{2}^{2} \xi_{3}^{2}\right]^{-1} \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In [1], $k$ and $h$ were both zero and $\Psi$ could be represented as a double integral. A closed form formule for $\Psi$ seems impossible to obtain in this case, beyond the triple integral obtained by applying the Fourier inversion formula to equation (4.6). The comparison between the results from [1] and. the case of any strain energy function will therefore be made by perturbing from $k=h=0$ and calculating the first perturbation. To the first power in $k-h$,
(4.7) $\bar{\Psi}=\left(\xi_{2}^{2}+\xi_{3}^{2}\right)^{-1}\left(a \xi_{2}^{2}+c \xi_{3}^{2}-\rho \omega^{2}\right)^{-1}-(k-h) \xi_{2}^{2} \xi_{3}^{2}\left(\xi_{2}^{2}+\xi_{3}^{2}\right)^{-2}\left(a \xi_{2}^{2}+c \xi_{3}^{2}-\rho \omega^{2}\right)^{-2}$. The inverse of the first term of the right hand side of equation (4.7) was encountered in [1]. The second term will be dealt with in the next section.

The inversion of $\bar{p}$ follows a similar pattern to that of $\bar{u}_{2}$ and $\bar{u}_{3}$. Expension of (4.4) to first powers in $h$ and $k$ gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{p}=\frac{\Phi_{1}}{\left(\xi_{2}^{2}+\xi_{3}^{2}\right)}+\frac{h \Phi_{2}+k \Phi_{3}}{\left(\xi_{2}^{2}+\xi_{3}^{2}\right)\left(a \xi_{2}^{2}+c \xi_{3}^{2}-\rho \omega^{2}\right)}+\frac{(k-h) \Phi_{4}}{\left(\xi_{2}^{2}+\xi_{3}^{2}\right)\left(a \xi_{2}^{2}+c \xi_{3}^{2}-\rho \omega^{2}\right)}, \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the $\Phi_{i}$ are fumctions of $\xi_{2}$ and $\xi_{3}$ such that each term above is
homogeneous of degree -1 in $\xi_{2}, \xi_{3}$ and $\omega$. The problems of inverting $\bar{p}$ are similar to those for $\Phi$.
5. The response to impulsive line tractions: (ii) Solutions The notation $F^{-1}\left(f\left(\xi_{k}, \omega\right)\right)$ is used for the inverse transform of $f$,

$$
\frac{1}{(2 \pi)^{3}} \int_{\Omega} e^{-i\left(\xi_{p} y_{p}+\omega t\right)} f\left(\xi_{k}, \omega\right) d \xi_{k} d \omega
$$

Now

$$
F^{-1}\left[\xi_{2}^{2}\left(\xi_{2}^{2}+\xi_{3}^{2}\right)^{-2}\right]=-\frac{1}{8 \pi}\left[\log \left(y_{2}^{2}+y_{3}^{2}\right)+2 y_{2}^{2}\left(y_{2}^{2}+y_{3}^{2}\right)^{-1}+K\right]
$$

where $K$ is an arbitrary constant. Also

$$
F^{-1}\left(\left(a \xi_{2}^{2}+c \xi_{3}^{2}-\rho \omega^{2}\right)^{-2}\right\}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{1}{4 \pi \rho}\left(t^{2}-\frac{\rho y_{2}^{2}}{a}-\frac{\rho y_{3}^{2}}{c}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & t>\left(\frac{\rho y_{2}^{2}}{a}+\frac{\rho y_{3}^{2}}{c}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{array},\right.
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
F^{-1} \frac{\xi_{2}^{2} \xi_{3}^{2}}{\left(\xi_{2}^{2}+\xi_{3}^{2}\right)^{2}\left(a \xi_{2}^{2}+c \xi_{3}^{2}-\rho \omega^{2}\right)^{2}}=-\frac{1}{32 \pi^{2}(a c)^{\frac{1}{2} \rho}} \frac{\partial^{2} x}{\partial y_{3}^{2}} \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, by the convolution theorem,

$$
x=\int_{D_{1}}\left(t^{2}-\frac{\rho z_{2}^{2}}{a}-\frac{\rho z_{3}^{2}}{c}\right\}^{\frac{3}{2}}\left\{\log \left[\left(y_{2}-z_{2}\right)^{2}+\left(y_{3}-z_{3}\right)^{2}\right]\right.
$$

$$
\left.+\frac{2\left(y_{2}-z_{2}\right)^{2}}{\left(y_{2}-z_{2}\right)^{2}+\left(y_{3}-z_{3}\right)^{2}}\right\} d z_{2} d z_{3}
$$

The constant $K$ is suppressed because it vanishes on differentiating $X$. $D_{1}$ is the set of points inside the ellipse $t^{2}=\rho a^{-1} z_{2}^{2}+\rho c^{-1} z_{3}^{2}$.

This integral is similar to one which appeared in [1] and the techniques used there can be applied in the present case. Except when $a=c$, it does not appear possible to evaluate $X$ in terms of elementary functions, however the asymptotic forms of the derivatives of $X$ can be found for $y_{2}^{2}+y_{3}^{2} \gg t^{2}$ and $y_{2}^{2}+y_{3}^{2} \ll t^{2}$. When $y_{2}^{2}+y_{3}^{2} \gg t^{2}$ the substitutions $z_{2}=t \zeta_{2}, z_{3}=t \zeta_{3}$ can be made into the integral (5.2). The integrand may then be expanded in a power series in $t$ and integrated term by term. It then follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
x=2 \pi a^{\frac{1}{2}} c^{\frac{1}{2}}\left[\log \left(y_{2}^{2}+y_{3}^{2}\right)+2 y_{2}^{2}\left(y_{2}^{2}+y_{3}^{2}\right)^{-1}\right] \frac{t^{3}}{3}+o\left(t^{4}\right) \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Bxact error bounds can be given when $X$ is approximated by truncating the series. Combining this result with the corresponding ones from [1] the . expansions of $u_{2}$ and $u_{3}$ take the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{2}, u_{3}=\left(t \phi_{1}\left(y_{2} y_{3}\right)+o\left(t^{2}\right)\right)+(k-h)\left(t^{3} \phi_{2}\left(y_{2}, y_{3}\right)+o\left(t^{4}\right)\right) \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

A similar technique can be applied to the pressure to give

$$
\begin{equation*}
p=\delta(t) \pi_{1}\left(y_{2}, y_{3}\right)+\left(h \pi_{2}\left(y_{2}, y_{3}\right)+k \pi_{3}\left(y_{2}, y_{3}\right)\right)\left(t+o\left(t^{2}\right)\right) \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The functions $\phi_{i}$ and $\pi_{i}$ are linear in $\omega_{2}$ and $\omega_{3}$. Each can be calculated explicitly if required; $\pi_{1}$ and $\phi_{1}$ are given in [1]. For $t$ small the operations of differentiation and series expansion commute.

The important results implied by equations (5.4) and (5.5) are that:
(a) for small times, to first order the displacements do not differ between those for a Mooney material and one with a more general strain energy function;
(b) for small times, a term of order $t$, which is absent for a Mooney material, appears in the pressure when the generalisation to any strain energy function is made.

When $t \gg\left(y_{2}^{2}+y_{3}^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ the problem is considerably more difficult. The field point $\left(y_{2}, y_{3}\right)$ lies inside $D_{1}$, the domain of integration of
equation (5.2). The differentiations needed to calculate $u_{2}$ and $u_{3}$ cannot be taken under the integral sign since divergent integrals result, nor is the scaling of the variables to remove the dependence on $t$ from the domain $D_{1}$ of any assistance. The expansion of the derivatives of $X$ in inverse powers of $t$ is accomplished by proving that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{\partial x}{\partial y_{3}}=\int_{D_{2}}\left(t^{2}-\frac{\rho z_{2}^{2}}{a}-\frac{\rho z_{3}^{2}}{a}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{3}}\left[\log \left(\left(z_{2}-y_{2}\right)^{2}+\left(z_{3}-y_{3}\right)^{2}\right)\right.  \tag{5.6}\\
&+\frac{2\left(z_{2}-y_{2}\right)^{2}}{\left.\left(z_{2}-y_{2}\right)^{2}+\left(z_{3}-y_{3}\right)^{2}\right] d z_{2} d z_{3}}
\end{align*}
$$

where $D_{2}$ is the interior of the ellipse $\frac{\rho z_{2}^{2}}{a}+\frac{\rho z_{3}^{2}}{c}=\frac{\rho y_{2}^{2}}{a}+\frac{\rho y_{3}^{2}}{c}$. Note that the dependence on $t$ is removed from the domain of integration so that the term $\left(t^{2}-\frac{\rho z_{2}^{2}}{a}-\frac{\rho z_{3}^{2}}{c}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ can be expanded immediately in powers of $t^{-1}$. The lemma implied by the statement of equation (5.6) corresponds to a similar result in [1]. The proofs of the two lemmas have identical structures. An outline of the proof of (5.6) is given in the last section; for fuller details the reader is referred to [1].

When the square root in equation (5.6) is expanded in inverse powers of $t$ the integrals obtained can all be evaluated in terms of elementary functions. It is found that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial x}{\partial y_{3}}=n_{1}\left(y_{2}, y_{3}\right) t+n_{2}\left(y_{2}, y_{3}\right) \frac{1}{t}+\frac{n_{3}\left(y_{2}, y_{3}\right)}{t^{3}}+\ldots \tag{5.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\eta_{1}$ is linear in $y_{2}$ and $y_{3}, \eta_{2}$ is homogeneous of degree 3 in $y_{2}$ and $y_{3}$, and so on. An identical statement applies to $\frac{\partial x}{\partial y_{2}}$. The displacements $u_{2}$ and $u_{3}$ are linear combinations of the fourth derivatives of $X$, thus the leading term in equation (5.7) is eliminated When the results from [1] are combined with these results the asymptotic
form of $u_{2}$ and $u_{3}$ is obtained thus:

$$
\begin{align*}
& u_{2} \sim \frac{w_{2}}{2 \pi}\left(\frac{\frac{1}{a^{\frac{3}{2}}}\left(a^{\frac{3}{2}}+c^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)}{}-\frac{(k-h)}{c^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(a^{\frac{1}{2}}+c^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{2}}\right) \frac{1}{t},  \tag{5.8}\\
& u_{3} \sim \frac{w_{3}}{2 \pi}\left(\frac{\frac{1}{c^{\frac{1}{2}}}\left(a^{\frac{1}{2}}+c^{\frac{1}{3}}\right)}{}+\frac{(k-h)}{a^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(a^{\frac{1}{2}}+c^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{2}}\right) \frac{1}{t} . \tag{5.9}
\end{align*}
$$

Similar techniaues can be used to show that the pressure is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
p \sim \frac{1}{\pi t^{3}}\left(\theta_{1}\left(y_{2}, y_{3}\right) k+\theta_{2}\left(y_{2}, y_{3}\right) h\right) \tag{5.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\theta_{1}=-\frac{\left(a^{\frac{1}{2}}+2 c^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) w_{2} y_{2}+a^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{3} y_{3}}{a^{\frac{1}{2}} c^{\frac{3}{2}}\left(a^{\frac{1}{2}}+c^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{3}}, \text { and } \theta_{2}=\frac{a^{\frac{1}{2}} w_{2} y_{2}+\left(c^{\frac{1}{2}}+2 a^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) w_{3} y_{3}}{a^{\frac{1}{2}} c^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(a^{\frac{1}{2}}+c^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{3}}
$$

The important features of these results are:
(a) that the displacements are independent of position to order $t^{-1}$,
(b) that the responses to the forces are uncoupled to order $t^{-1}$,
(c) that the distinction between a Mooney material and an arbitrary hyperelastic material is detectable in the coefficient of $t^{-1}$ in the displacements,
(d) that the pressure behaves as $t^{-3}$ so that the $t^{-1}$ term remains absent in the pressure for an arbitrary hyperelastic material.

The properties (c) and (d) invert those noted in the case of $t$ small.
6. Differentiation of the function $x$ of equation (5.2) under the integral sign

It is clear that (5.6) follows from (5.2) if it can be proved that the contribution to $X$ of the integral taken over the elliptic annulus $D_{1}-D_{2}$ is constant. For convenience the substitutions $y_{2}=a^{\frac{3}{2}} y_{2}$,
$z_{2}=a^{\frac{1}{2}} z_{2}, y_{3}=c^{\frac{1}{2}} y_{3}, z_{3}=c^{\frac{3}{2}} z_{3}$ are made, then it suffices to prove that
(6.1) $\quad x_{A}=\int_{A}\left(\rho t^{2}-z_{2}^{2}-z_{3}^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\{\log \left(a\left(y_{2}-z_{2}\right)^{2}+c\left(Y_{3}-z_{3}\right)^{2}\right)\right.$

$$
\left.+\frac{2 a\left(Y_{2}-Z_{2}\right)^{2}}{a\left(Y_{2}-Z_{2}\right)^{2}+c\left(Y_{3}-Z_{3}\right)^{2}}\right\} d z_{2} d z_{3}
$$

(where $A$ is the annulus $Y_{2}^{2}+Y_{3}^{2}<Z_{2}^{2}+Z_{3}^{2}<\rho t^{2}$ ) is constant.
Suppose $0<c<a$ ( $c, a \geq 0$ by assumption). Then $-1<\frac{a-a}{a}<0$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
a v_{2}^{2}+c v_{3}^{2} \equiv a\left(v_{2}^{2}+U_{3}^{2}\right)\left(1+\frac{a-a}{a} \frac{v_{3}^{2}}{v_{2}^{2}+U_{3}^{2}}\right) \tag{6.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now

$$
\left|\frac{c-a}{a} \frac{u_{3}^{2}}{u_{2}^{2}+u_{3}^{2}}\right|<1
$$

so (6.2) may be used to expand the integrand of (6.1). The series may legitimately be integrated termwise and a series of terms of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{n}\left(Y_{2}, Y_{3}\right)=\left(\frac{a-a}{a}\right)^{n-1} \int_{A}\left(\rho t^{2}-z_{2}^{2}-z_{3}^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{\left(y_{2}-z_{2}\right)^{2}\left(y_{3}-z_{3}\right)^{2 n-2}}{\left(\frac{\left.y_{2}-z_{2}\right)^{2}+\left(y_{3}-z_{3}\right)^{2}}{n}\right.}\right) d z_{2} d z_{3} \tag{6.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

is obtained. Such terms arose in the corresponding proof in [1]. It was proved there that each $F_{n}$ is independent of $Y_{2}$ and $Y_{3}$. This proves the assertion about $X_{A}$, since $X_{A}$ being the sum of a series of constants, is itself constant.

The property of the $F_{n}$ stated above depends on the form of the difference function in the integrand on the right hand side of (6.3). An examination of the proof given in [1] reveals that if the difference
function is homogeneous of degree zero in $\left(Y_{2}-Z_{2}\right)$ and $\left(Y_{3}-Z_{3}\right)$ then $F_{n}$ is necessarily constant. Hence the property used in this paper and in [1] is true for any integral which can be expanded in a series of terms $F_{n}$ provided only that the resulting series of constents is convergent.
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